

**REMARKS**

**INTRODUCTION:**

In accordance with the foregoing, no claims have been canceled, claims 1 and 5 have been amended, and no claims have been added. No new matter is being presented, and approval and entry are respectfully requested.

Claims 1-3 and 5-26 are pending and under consideration. Reconsideration is respectfully requested.

**CLAIM OBJECTIONS:**

At page 2 of the Office Action, claims 1-3 and 5-12 were objected to. Claim 1, from which claims 2, 3, and 5-12 depend, directly or indirectly, has been amended. Therefore, it is respectfully requested that the outstanding claim objections be withdrawn.

**REJECTION UNDER 35 U.S.C. §112:**

At page 2 of the Office Action, claims 1-3 and 5-12 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph, for the reasons set forth therein. Claim 1, from which claims 2, 3, and 5-12 depend, directly or indirectly, has been amended. This rejection is traversed and reconsideration is requested.

Regarding claim 1, the phrase "the desired program data" in 11 has been amended to recite "desired program data." The phrase "the plurality of received TSs of data" has been amended to recite "the plurality of TSs of data."

The Examiner has taken the position that the phrase "the desired program data from one of the program data" is unclear because only one program data is mentioned in line 8. Applicants respectfully note that according to Encarta® World English Dictionary [North American Edition], use of the term "data" is considered proper both in the singular and in the plural. <http://encarta.msn.com/>.

Regarding claim 5, the phrase "the desired portion" has been amended to recite "a desired portion."

Claims 1-3 and 5-12 are now believed to be in condition for allowance. Accordingly, withdrawal of the §112 rejection is respectfully requested.

REJECTION UNDER 35 U.S.C. §102:

At page 3 of the Office Action, claims 13-16, 18-20, and 22-26 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,434,170 to Movshovich et al. The rejection is traversed and reconsideration is requested.

Regarding claims 13, 22, 24, and 25 the Examiner cites Movshovich for simultaneously processing transport streams as recited. The Applicants respectfully disagree. Claims 13, 22, 24, and 25 recite:

A method of simultaneously demultiplexing plural transport streams of data having different structures (claim 13);  
simultaneously processing the DSS transport stream and the MPEG-2 transport stream (claim 22);  
displaying the first program data selected by a user while simultaneously transmitting the second program data over an IEEE1394 bus (claim 24); and  
simultaneously demultiplexing a first and a second of the transport streams of data (claim 25).

Movshovich does not teach or even mention multiple transport streams having different structures being possessed simultaneously. Rather, Movshovich mentions a multi-program transport stream (MPTS), which is a multiplex of a number of single program transport streams (SPTS). Movshovich also mentions that time division multiplexing may be used to concurrently transmit the multiple programs in an MPTS. The Examiner asserts that Movshovich teaches a multiplex of various single program transport streams (DVB and DSS transport streams). The Applicants respectfully disagree that this suggests multiple transport streams having different structures being processed simultaneously, as recited in claims 13, 22, 24 and 25.

The Applicants respectfully submit that since Movshovich fails to teach or suggest all of the features of claims 13, 22, 24, and 25, these claims are allowable over Movshovich. Thus withdrawal of the 102(e) rejection is respectfully requested.

Regarding claims 14-16, 18-20, 23, and 26, these claims are dependent on one of independent claims 13 and 24, and are therefore believed to be allowable for at least the reasons noted above.

## REJECTION UNDER 35 U.S.C. §103

At page 4 of the Office Action, claim 21 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Movshovich. The reasons for the rejection are set forth in the Office Action and therefore not repeated. The rejection is traversed and reconsideration is requested.

The Applicants respectfully submit that the rejection fails to establish a prima facie case of obviousness. To establish a prima facie case of obviousness, three basic criteria must be met. MPEP 2142. First, there must be some suggestion or motivation, either in the references themselves or in the knowledge generally available to one of ordinary skill in the art, to modify the reference or to combine reference teachings. *Id.* Second, there must be a reasonable expectation of success. *Id.* Finally, the prior art reference (or references when combined) must teach or suggest all the claim limitations. *Id.* The teaching or suggestion to make the claimed combination and the reasonable expectation of success must both be found in the prior art, and not based on applicant's disclosure. *Id.*

The Examiner admits that Movshovich does not disclose scrambling the descrambled modified program data for external transmission. Further, claim 21 is dependent on independent claim 13, which, as discussed above, contains features not present in Movshovich. Thus withdrawal of the §103(a) rejection is respectfully requested.

## ALLOWABILITY OF CLAIMS 1-3, 5-12, AND 17

Applicants acknowledge with appreciation that claims 1-3 and 5-12 have been found to contain allowable subject matter. Applicants acknowledge with appreciation that claim 17 has been allowed.

## CONCLUSION:

In accordance with the foregoing, it is respectfully submitted that all outstanding objections and rejections have been overcome and/or rendered moot. And further, that all pending claims patentably distinguish over the prior art. Thus, there being no further outstanding objections or rejections, the application is submitted as being in condition for allowance which action is earnestly solicited.

If the Examiner has any remaining issues to be addressed, it is believed that prosecution can be expedited by the Examiner contacting the undersigned attorney for a telephone interview


to discuss resolution of such issues.

If there are any underpayments or overpayments of fees associated with the filing of this Amendment, please charge and/or credit the same to our Deposit Account No. 19-3935.

Respectfully submitted,

STAAS & HALSEY LLP

Date: JUNE 1, 2005

By:   
Christopher P. Mitchell  
Registration No. 54,946

1201 New York Ave, N.W., Suite 700  
Washington, D.C. 20005  
Telephone: (202) 434-1500  
Facsimile: (202) 434-1501